

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/991,852	11/16/2001	Gary S. Jouas	10238.002	9284	
27887	7590 06/08/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FENNEMORE CRAIG			BUSHEY, CHARLES S		
3003 NORT SUITE 2600	H CENTRAL AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHOENIX,			1724		
			DATE MAILED: 06/08/200	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/991,852	JOUAS, GARY S.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott Bushey	1724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence addres	s
THE REPLY FILED 20 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required the final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of this a r: (1) a timely filed amendment opeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	pplication. A proper reply to which places the applicatio	o a n in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)	]	
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	this Advisory Action, or (2) the date so opire later than SIX MONTHS from the WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS	mailing date of the final rejection. OF THE FINAL REJECTION. Se	e MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the per fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration da (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	riod of extension and the corresponding to of the shortened statutory period for office later than three months after the contractions and the contraction of the con	ng amount of the fee. The approper r reply originally set in the final Off	iate extension ice action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appells 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require f	urther consideration and/or sea	arch (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	ote below);		
<ul><li>(c)</li></ul>	ion in better form for appeal by	materially reducing or simp	lifying the
(d) they present additional claims without car	nceling a corresponding number	er of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) we canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed an	nendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because		considered but does NOT p	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SOL	ELY to issues which were n	iewly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendr explanation of how the new or amended claim	, , ,		d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo	ows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .			
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)		ed by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State			,
10. Other:	, ,	MITTE	6-7-04
		Scott Bushey Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1724	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

## **Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)**

Continuation of 2. NOTE: New Issues: Applicant's amendments to claims 1 and 7 have changed the scope of claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 18, and 19, which would require further consideration with respect to those claims. Also, it is noted that applicant has not made similar changes t independent claims 13 and 16, which were finally rejected along with independent claims 1 and 7 under the same art rejection. Applicant's remarks suggest that claim 13 was amended by the After Final amendment, which it was not, and further applicant's remarks do not even mention claims 16 and 17, which were also rejected along with claims 1, 7, and 13 under the same art rejection in the Final rejection. With respect to the new matter rejection made in the Final rejection, it is not the Examiner's recollection that the rejection was overcome by the remarks made by applicant in the telephone conversation of 5-18-04.